



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/874,104	06/04/2001	Robert E. Haines	10003219-1	6048

7590 07/27/2006

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY  
Intellectual Property Administration  
P.O. Box 272400  
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER
----------

SHINGLES, KRISTIE D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2141

DATE MAILED: 07/27/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/874,104

Applicant(s)

HAINES ET AL.

Examiner

Kristie Shingles

Art Unit

2141

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 April 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

*Response to Amendment*  
*Applicant has not amended any claims.*

*Claims 1-20 are pending.*

### *Response to Arguments*

1. In view of the Appeal Brief filed on 4/20/2006, PROSECUTION IS HEREBY REOPENED.

To avoid abandonment of the application, appellant must exercise one of the following two options:

- (1) file a reply under 37 CFR 1.111 (if this Office action is a non-final) or a reply under 37 CFR 1.113 (if this Office action is final); or,
- (2) request reinstatement of the appeal.

If reinstatement of the appeal is requested, such request must be accompanied by a supplemental appeal brief, but no new amendment, affidavits (37 CFR 1.130, 1.131 or 1.132) or other evidence are permitted. See 37 CFR 1.193(b)(2).

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an

Art Unit: 2141

international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. **Claims 1-3** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by *Leveridge* (US Publication 2002/0178070).

a. **Regarding claim 1**, *Leveridge* teaches a method of requesting a resource having a URL from a WEB server, comprising:

- transmitting a first request to a remote computer for a cookie that is valid for the URL (page 2 paragraph 0047; page 3 paragraphs 0052-0056, 0059—client sends first request to gateway for a cookie valid for the URL); then
- receiving a first cookie from the remote computer (page 3 paragraphs 0052-0056, 0059—client receives cookie from gateway); and
- transmitting both the first cookie and a request for the resource to the WEB Server (page 3 paragraphs 0052-0056 and 0059-006; page 5 paragraph 0077—cookie and request are sent to third-party server).

b. **Regarding claim 2**, *Leveridge* teaches the method of claim 1, further comprising: receiving input from a user defining the URL; and wherein the first request transmitting step is automatically performed in response to receiving the user input (page 3 paragraphs 0052-0055; page 5 paragraph 0077).

c. **Regarding claim 3**, *Leveridge* teaches the method of claim 2, wherein the first request transmitting step is performed by transmitting the first request over a network to the remote computer (page 3 paragraphs 0052-0055; page 5 paragraph 0077).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. **Claims 4-17** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Qian et al* (US Publication 2002/0032731) in view of *Callaghan et al* (US Publication 2002/0007317).

a. **Regarding claim 6**, *Qian et al* teach a computing device, comprising:

- means for receiving a first cookie that is valid for a first URL from a first WEB client (paragraphs 0009, 0012);
- means for receiving a first request for a cookie that is valid for a first URL from a second WEB client (paragraph 0012);
- and means for responding to the first request by transmitting the first cookie to the second WEB client if the first URL is within the first range of URLs (paragraph 0012, 0078).

*Qian et al* fail to explicitly teach a range of URLs. However *Callaghan et al* teach the sharing of cookies for a range of URLs (Abstract, paragraphs 0053, 0059-0063 and 0073). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of *Qian et al* with *Callaghan et al* for receiving a first cookie that is valid for a first range of URL'S from a first WEB client; because it is well-known in the art that URLs that share a common tail, (such as “.ibm.com” or “.us.gov.”) form a range of URLs

with that distinct tail characteristic and with a unique cookie associated with that particular URL range.

b. **Claims 4, 9 and 10** are substantially equivalent to claim 6 and are therefore rejected under the same basis.

c. **Regarding claim 7**, *Qian et al* with *Callaghan et al* teach the computing device of claim 6, *Qian et al* further teach wherein the first WEB client and the second WEB client are two different computing devices (paragraphs 0012, 0059).

d. **Regarding claim 8**, *Qian et al* with *Callaghan et al* teach the computing device of claim 7, *Qian et al* further teach wherein the first cookie receiving means is configured to receive the first cookie from the first WEB client over a network; and wherein the first request responding means is configured to transmit the first cookie to the send WEB client over the network (paragraphs 0012, 0059, 0072).

e. **Regarding claim 9**, *Qian et al* with *Callaghan et al* teach the computing device of claim 8, further comprising: means for receiving a second request that defines a second URL from the first WEB client; and means for responding to the second request (page 3, section 0052 and page 4, section 0053-0055 and 0058-0059).

f. **Regarding claim 11**, *Qian et al* with *Callaghan et al* teach the computing device of claim 10, *Qian et al* further teach wherein the network comprises the INTERNET (paragraph 0003; *Callaghan et al*: paragraph 0046).

g. **Claims 12-16** contains limitations that are substantially equivalent to claims 1 and 6 and are therefore rejected under the same basis.

h. **Regarding claim 17**, *Qian et al* teach the system of claim 16, further comprising a monitoring device operable to monitor a first device to detect when the device generates a pre-defined signal and to respond thereto by generating a notification that the signal was generated; and wherein the first WEB client and the second WEB client are operable by a user to retrieve the notification (paragraphs 0059, 0060, 0066, 0071).

6. **Claims 18-20** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Qian et al* (US Publication 2002/0032731) in view of *Callaghan et al* (US Publication 2002/0007317) and further in view of *Silverbrook et al* (US 6,813,039).

a. **Regarding claim 18**, *Qian et al* with *Callaghan et al* teach the system of claim 17, as applied above, yet fail to teach a printer. However, *Silverbrook et al* teach a printer wherein the sensing device that monitors the status of the printer (Abstract, col.24 lines 6-8). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of *Qian et al* and *Callaghan et al* with *Silverbrook et al* by having a monitoring device for a printer; because this allows the users to monitor the printer's status to determine when maintenance is required.

b. **Regarding claim 19**, *Qian et al* and *Callaghan et al* with *Silverbrook et al* teach the system of 18, *Silverbrook et al* further teach the system comprising: the printer; and wherein the printer includes a replaceable consumable cartridge; and wherein the printer is operable to generate the signal when a consumable in the cartridge moves below a pre-determined level (col.23 line 50).

Regarding claim 20, *Qian et al* and *Callaghan et al* with *Silverbrook et al* teach the system of claim 19, *Silverbrook et al* further teach wherein the printer is a laser printer (col.15 lines 30-32).

### *Conclusion*

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure: Ikenoue (5,068,807), Narin et al (7,039,699), Montulli (5,774,670), Engeldrum et al (6,963,668), Andrew et al (2002/0073152), Blumenau (6,529,952), Lu et al (2004/0015580).

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kristie Shingles whose telephone number is 571-272-3888. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rupal Dharia can be reached on 571-272-3880. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

*Kristie Shingles*  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2141

kds

  
RUPAL DHARIA  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER